

[21st October 1927]

(b) whether the Government have taken or propose to take any steps to enable applicants to obtain certified copies in urgent cases, within the course of one day, if necessary, by levying a special fee not exceeding Re. 1 per whole application as in the registration offices?

A —(a) No.

(b) No such proposal has been considered by the Government.

Mr. A. B. SHETTY :—“ May I request the Government to find out whether there is not usually inordinate delay in the granting of certified copies in the Civil and Revenue courts in the mufassal ? ”

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—“ If specific instances of inordinate delay are brought to notice, an enquiry will be made.”

Criminal Justice

Order served by the Sub-Magistrate of Salem under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, on the organizers of the Arya-Vaisya Youths' Conference.

* 775 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether he is aware that the Arya-Vaisya Youths' Conference took place at Salem on 4th July 1927;

(b) whether the Sub-Magistrate of Salem was present at the Conference hall on the afternoon of that day;

(c) whether it is the fact that people who have nothing to do with the Youths' Conference had taken possession of the Conference hall prior to the time that the adjourned meeting of the Youths' Conference was to have been held;

(d) whether it is the fact that the President of the Youths' Conference Mr. Mothey Narayana Rao, M.L.C., Mr. T. Adinarayana Chettiyar, M.L.C., and Mr. T. Bagavantam Gupta, B.A., B.L., requested the Sub-Magistrate to help them to get possession of the hall and whether they also made a similar appeal to the police sub-inspectors present there;

(e) whether it is a fact that neither the Police nor the Sub-Magistrate would help the organizers of the Youths' Conference to regain possession of the Conference hall from people who were unlawfully occupying it and creating noise and disturbance;

(f) whether it is a fact that the Sub-Magistrate without taking any effort to help the organizers of the Conference to gain possession of the hall suddenly wanted to serve an order under section 144, Criminal Procedure Code, on Mr. T. Bagavantam Gupta and the organizers of the Youths' Conference;

(g) whether it is a fact that when Mr. T. Bagavantam Gupta asked the Sub-Magistrate whether he had ascertained the facts as to who were the people rightfully entitled to possession of the hall and also the names of those who were obstructing them, the Sub-Magistrate admitted he had not made any such enquiries;

(h) whether it is a fact that the Sub-Magistrate retired for a while and then suddenly entered the Conference hall and cleared it with the help of the police making a pretence of reading something which however nobody could hear;

21st October 1927]

(i) whether it is a fact that after clearing the hall he prevented any one, including the organizers of the Conference, from entering the hall and continuing the Conference; and

(j) what is the order read out by the Sub-Magistrate when clearing the hall and under what provision of law did he do so?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) Yes.

(c) The Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Arya-Vaisya Youths' Conference announced at 12 noon on the 4th July 1927 that the Youths' Conference was over and that there would be a religious conference that afternoon. The religious conference was accordingly held in the hall in the afternoon.

(d) & (e) The facts are as follow:—

The organizers of both the conferences applied to the Sub-Magistrate for help; the party of the religious conference to retain, that of the Youths' Conference, to regain possession of the hall. Both parties were persuaded by the Sub-Magistrate and the Police to settle their differences amicably. While the Police and the Sub-Magistrate were endeavouring to bring both the parties to an amicable settlement two members of the Youths' Conference tried to disturb the religious conference. This caused a commotion; the situation assumed some seriousness and the proprietor of the hall also wanted the hall to be restored to him as he apprehended damage to his property. The Sub-Magistrate therefore requested the president of the religious conference to wind up the proceedings and under section 127, Criminal Procedure Code, directed the two parties to leave the hall. This they did peacefully.

(f) No.

(g) The Government have no information as to any questions said to have been asked by Mr. T. Bhagavantam Gupta but they believe that the Sub-Magistrate did make enquiries as to which party was entitled to possession of the hall.

(h) No.

(i) Yes, for the reasons stated in the answer to clauses (d) and (e).

(j) No order was read out by the Sub-Magistrate as alleged.

MR. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“With reference to clause (d) of the question, may I know from the hon. the Law Member whether he is aware that the President of the Youths' Conference is Mr. Mothey Narayana Rao, and that he asked the Sub-Magistrate to help him to get the possession of the hall, and if so, may I know why the Sub-Magistrate did not accede to his request but agreed to the request of somebody else who had no right to adjourn the Conference? And may I know what are the facts?”

The hon. MR. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL :—“The facts have been placed before the House.”

MR. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“May I invite your attention to the answer given in clauses (d) and (e)? There it is stated that ‘the organizers of both the Conferences applied to the Sub-Magistrate for help’. May I ask why the Sub-Magistrate went out of his way and ignored the request of

[21st October 1927]

Mr. Mothey Narayana Rao and the President of the Conference and agreed to the request of somebody else? Will the hon. Member be pleased to throw some light on this information?"

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"This information is just now given to me by the hon. Member opposite."

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR:—"The information is already in the question in clauses (d) and (e)."

The hon. Mr. A. Y. G. CAMPBELL:—"I have already fully answered clauses (d) and (e)."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member will have to satisfy himself with the answer given."

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR:—"The answer given is that somebody else asked the Sub-Magistrate to intervene and he asked him what had to be done in the matter. My complaint is that the Sub-Magistrate did not ask the proper person as to what had to be done in the matter."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member on behalf of the Government says that the answer has already been given. So, the hon. Member, Mr. Adinarayana Chettiyar, will have to be satisfied whether the answer is good, bad or indifferent."

Cases conducted before the Subdivisional Magistrate of Nandyal.

* 776 Q.—Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO: With reference to the reply to the supplementary question to question No. 324 regarding cases conducted before the Subdivisional Magistrate of Nandyal, answered on 27th August 1927, that he will call for information, will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to call for it and place it on the table of the House?

A.—The information is placed on the table.^a

Irrigation

Repairs to the supply channel to the Markapur tank.

* 777 Q.—Mr. G. HARISARVOTTAMA RAO: With reference to the reply to my question No. 336 answered on 27th August 1927 regarding repairs to the supply channel to the Markapur tank, will the hon. the Law Member be now pleased to call for the information and place the same on the table of the House?

A.—The Chief Engineer's report dated 15th October 1927 is laid on the table.^b

Q 778.—Please see page 351 infra.

Preparation of estimate for the reconstruction of Thorrigedda sluice in East Godavari.

* 779 Q.—Mr. K. V. R. SWAMI: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether any estimate is prepared for the reconstruction of Thorrigedda sluice in East Godavari; and

(b) if not, whether the Government propose to prepare one at an early date?

^a Printed as Appendix V on page 397 infra.

^b Printed as Appendix V-A on pages 397-398 infra.